FY 2004 Budget Meetings Formal Comments Sent to DOE-RL

1). Joseph L. Miller, M. D. Sandy, Oregon

- Have not commented in years past under the impression that DOE is impervious to input
- Found that the Columbia River to be the most highly contaminated with radioactivity of any river in the world
- Protect the water supply

2). Mary Alberti Seattle, Washington

- Stop using unlined, leaking low level burial grounds
- Stop using clean up funds to subsidize the disposal of waste shipped to Hanford

3). Helen Sargeant Spokane, Washington

- Proposal to leave high level waste in aging tanks & pour cement into the liquid is unacceptable
- DOE must cleanup and vitrify all of the liquid in its 177 high level waste tanks
- Safety & health demand that vitrification be employed

4). Daniel Hassler Seattle, Washington

• Concerned that short term solutions are being proposed to avoid vitrifying, avoid dealing with tanks and contamination under and around tanks

5). Jodi Jamenson Seattle, Washington

• There cannot be any shortcuts and no compromises in this issue (cleanup); even if it costs more tax money

6). Barbara Pereira Portland, Oregon

- Use the money that was promised to cleanup Hanford and shut it down
- Shut down and drain FFTF
- The groundwater and our beloved Columbia River are a mess
- Why do we have nuclear power plants when the waste problem can't be solved?

7). Larry Boulanger Seattle, Washington

• I thought that the required cleanup was a given and that a responsible plan was in place and proceeding. Now I hear that DOE is again playing with technically flawed schemes, like putting cement in the troublesome tanks. Please tell me I am Wrong. I don't think we should be passing on these serious problems to yet another generation

8). Kurt Munnich Everett, Washington

- Understand that DOE has proposed to "stabilize and dispose" of nuclear waste at Hanford by adding ordinary cement to liquid radioactive waste and depositing the resulting solid waste in unlined trenches on the reservation
- This does not sound like a safe disposal method
- Please pay attention to the qualified scientists that are commenting on this plan

9). Elizabeth Bell Seattle, Washington

- We must eliminate the catastrophic pollution level from the Hanford activities
- This pollution must be lifted up and removed safely so that it no longer leaches into the surrounding ground water
- Protect the Columbia River

10). seadoyles@attbi.com

• Please continue to Hanford cleanup as originally agreed. The waste needs to be removed from the ground and processed into glass. This is the only reasonable Plan to keep the groundwater safe. Solidifying the existing waste is a terrible plan and does not address the potential deadly hazard to the waters and ground around Hanford. These people have lived with enough illness and death from something that long ago was sold to them as safe. Please do the right thing.

11). Holly Graham HollyGG@email.msn.com

- The cleanup at Hanford must go forward, waste issues must be dealt with in a responsible manner, not in the way things are planned at present
- Stop using Hanford's unlined leaking low-level burial grounds, and clean them up now
- Stop making Washington a waste burial ground for low and mixed level radioactive waste
- You hold our future in your hands

- 12). James R. McGrath, M. D. Charlotte B. McGrath, R.N.
 - The DOE plan calls for leaving waste in at least 60 tanks, mixing it with concrete. This is unacceptable. This plan has been rejected by 2 EISs and the public
 - DOE should fund an investigation of contamination around Hanford's low-level waste burial grounds and stop using unlined trenches
 - DOE must ask for the funds necessary to shut down FFTF. Delaying cleanup while keeping the rector on standby will waste \$320 million on cleanup funds

13). Connie Travaille Bellevue, Washington

- Stop using Hanford's unlined, leaking low-level waste burial grounds
- Fund an investigation of the contamination around the burial grounds
- Stop using cleanup funds to subsidize the disposal of waste shipped to Hanford
- Don't make Washington state into a national low-level mixed radioactive waste burial ground
- Ask Ecology to halt the use of unlined trenches at those sites at Hanford
- Strongly oppose DOE doubling the waste buried at Hanford

14). Eugene Hokanson Bellevue, Washington

- The people of Washington have made it very clear that we want Hanford cleaned up promptly and properly. We want leaky tanks removed and hazardous wastes Vitrified.
- DOE needs to ask for the funds necessary to do this ASAP

15). Peter Roth Seattle, Washington

- Stop using Hanford's unlined, leaking low-level waste burial grounds for storing nuclear waste from other parts of the country especially if DOE is using Hanford funds to subsidize the disposal of these wastes
- Fund an investigation of the contamination around the burial grounds

16). Barbara Clark Walla Walla, Washington

- I understand that in order to save money, DOE is requesting the TPA be revised to allow up to 75% if the high level liquid nuclear waste in SSTs, leaking tanks be covered with cement and left in the tanks
- We know the waste is leaking faster that originally expected. One plume already has reached the groundwater and threatens the Columbia. Before things get worse

DOE needs to cleanup the dangerous waste it has produced. Fully fund the cleanup, not a cover up.

17). Mark Wahl

Langley, Washington

- Appalled that DOE would consider concrete in the tanks, this proposal was found flawed.
- It could lead to:
 - Explosions
 - Easy escape into groundwater
 - Unknown chemical reactions
 - o Further dangerous cruse formations
 - o Vitirification is the only solution.

18). William Dixon

Richland, Washington

 Allow continuity of service for Hanford employees. Current practice discourages employees from accepting new challenges. This will help Hanford cleanup progress

19). Penny Berglund

pennyortho@aol.com

- These wastes need to be stabilized using the best available technology. Vitrification is the best solution.
- o It is not acceptable to make Hanford a nuclear sacrifice waste zone

20). Christi Bovee

Vancouver, Wash.

- Stop importing more waste & polluting the environment
- Protect the Northwest and the River

21). Barbara Conner

Portland, Oregon

- Protect the Columbia River & the groundwater
- Cleanup 300 Area to unrestricted use, makes long term economic sense

22). Barbara Iafrate

Iafrate Barbara@hotmail.com

- Don't leave high level waste in the ground stored in the Central Plateau
- Alternative solution presented. Do the right thing

23). Joseph L. Miller, M. D. Sandy, Oregon (second letter)

- Native Americans, residents of Portland are endangered by leaking wastes at Hanford. Clean it up as soon as possible
- Do not see concrete plans for vitrification of all the wastes. Need a clear description of the actual planned activity.

24). Les Davenport Richland, Washington

- Obtain adequate funding each year (through FY '08) to accelerate cleanup
- Highest priorities should be: tanks waste treatment; SNF fuel removal/transfer; PU stabilization; and safe storage at PFP. Consider tradeoffs carefully
- Continue/speed up of waste management programs
- Tank closure methods must meet laws/regulations & protect workers/public
- Characterize pre-1970 waste (TRU waste remediate and ship to WIPP)
- Decisions regarding GW remediation must be made quickly (soon)
- End states need to be fully defined
- 300 Area fence may move inward as cleanup progresses, but fence off 325, 326, 239 bldgs.
- Characterize 618-10/11 burial grounds

25). B Hawkins

bhawkins53@attbi.com

- Supports thorough cleanup that is safe for the environment. Not a quick fix.
- Pouring cement into tanks is no long rage solution

26). Linda Johns

Tigard, Oregon

- Concerned about increasing low level waste dumping at Hanford
- Do not add to the groundwater problem that already exists

27). Sahabra Tipton

- Do not pour concrete into the tanks. Concrete is porous look at our crumbling highways
- Plead against allowing Washington to take in nuclear waste of other states
- Do not destroy our clean air, pure water, and fertile land